

NOV 17 1922

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N.Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVI, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1922

WHOLE NO. 429

JULIUS CAESAR

A PHOTO-MASTERPIECE

from the

GEORGE KLEINE CYCLE OF FILM CLASSICS
On Six Reels

ENDORSEMENTS!!!

EDWARD MAYER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Department of Visual Instruction

"'Julius Caesar', your six reel photo-masterpiece, has proved to be one of our greatest films from the point of view of a distributor. The writer has viewed the film about ten times, and I dare say he will view it many more, but at no time has his interest waned".

WM. H. DUDLEY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, Bureau of Visual Instruction

"In a collection of educational motion picture films now aggregating over four thousand reels, 'Julius Caesar' ranks above all the others in educational value and demand".

HUGH W. NORMAN, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, Bureau of Visual Instruction

"We have distributed the film 'Julius Caesar' during the past year to a number of Schools and organizations in Indiana. I wish there were more pictures of this type that we could offer to Schools and other community organizations".

FRANCES E. SABIN, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, Assistant Professor of Latin

"I consider the 'Julius Caesar' film of great value in helping High School girls and boys to visualize the setting for Latin texts".

VICTOR D. HILL, OHIO UNIVERSITY, Department of Classical Languages

"The Photoplay 'Julius Caesar' is a production of unusually high quality. Besides being of great educational value it appeals to general audiences wherever shown. Since the beginning of its distribution to the Schools of Ohio under the auspices of Ohio University it has in every instance brought expressions of hearty approval and satisfaction, whether shown by the Schools themselves or as a public exhibition in local theaters cooperating with the Schools".

WELLINGTON PATRICK, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, Department of University Extension

"The film 'Julius Caesar' has been in use in Kentucky for the past eight months and has been distributed very widely. The demand became so great that we had to ask for another print and there has been continual interest in the film by Clubs, Schools, and other organizations throughout the State. There has never been a single disappointed customer and this it seems to me is one of the highest testimonials that a film can have. It is hoped that Schools and Churches and other organizations that are looking for real high grade films will be interested".

GEORGE KLEINE

NEW YORK: 729 Seventh Avenue

CHICAGO: 116 So. Michigan Avenue

(Continued on back cover)

D'OOGE: CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR

Armed with D'Ooge's Concise Latin Grammar the pupil finds it easy to conquer the complexity of Latin forms, syntax, and versification.

It pleases the eye with its carefully planned typographical arrangement.

It satisfies the mind by its simple treatment of the most difficult topics.



GINN AND COMPANY

Boston	New York	Chicago	London
--------	----------	---------	--------

Atlanta	Dallas	Columbus	San Francisco
---------	--------	----------	---------------

Moore's Horace

Odes Epodes Carmen Saeculare

Edited by CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE

Professor of Latin, Harvard University

465 Pages

Introduction and Notes

ALTHOUGH elementary matters have not been neglected in this edition, particular attention has been devoted to the literary side of Horace's work, and to his literary relations. The Introduction, besides dealing with the poet's life and writings, discusses his lyric meters and peculiarities of syntax.

The commentary is not limited to the baldest aids, but is intended to give such assistance in interpretation as may help students to some appreciation of Horace's art and charm. The introductory note to each poem shows by paraphrase or analysis the central idea and the manner of its development and also tells of the circumstances under which the verses were written. The relation of the poet to his Greek models and his influence on subsequent Latin literature, are clearly shown.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVI, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1922

WHOLE NO. 429

HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

(Continued from pages 27, 34)

II. TEXT EDITIONS

The text of Ovid is most easily found, for the ordinary student, in the edition in the Teubner Text Series. Fundamentally, this is the work of R. Merkel, but it was revised by R. Ehwald ("Editio Stereotypa"). Volume I (1903) contains the Amores, the Heroides, the Ars Amatoria, and the Remedia Amoris. Volume II (1900) contains the Metamorphoses. Volume III (1908) contains the Tristia, the Ibis, the Epistulae ex Ponto, and the Fasti.

The most ambitious text of the Metamorphoses is that of Magnus, Hugo. Metamorphoses (Weidmann, Berlin, 1914).

There are important reviews of this book, by Smith, Kirby Flower, in *The American Journal of Philology* 35 (1914), 207-211; Rand, Edward Kennard, *Classical Philology* 11 (1916), 46-60; and Slater, D. A., *The Classical Review* 29 (1915), 56-60.

Professor Smith describes this edition as "the first critical edition of Ovid's great narrative poem really worthy of the name".

The contents of the book are,—The Praefatio (pp. I-XXXIV), in which the editor discusses the MSS, critical subsidia, and similar matters concerned with the textual tradition; a Conspectus Siglorum (pp. 1-4); the Text and Critical Apparatus (pp. 5-624); the text of the Narrationes of Lactantius Placidus (pp. 625-721); and Index Nominum compiled by Paul Klink (pp. 722-766); three facsimiles of one page respectively of the Marcianus, 225-M, the Neapolitanus, IV F 3-N, and the Marcianus, 223-F.

On pages 208-209, Professor Smith summarizes Magnus's discussion of the textual tradition of the Metamorphoses, and sets forth his principles for constituting the text.

On page 210 there are some very interesting remarks concerning the collection of the Testimonia Veterum De Ovidio that forms part of Magnus's edition. Professor Smith notes that "quotation and verbal reminiscence <of Ovid> are undeniably less extensive than at first thought many of us would have guessed. . .". The largest individual contributor to the Testimonia is Seneca, the philosopher. From him there are 37 citations, which are taken from all parts of the Metamorphoses, not merely from the first few pages or from some single episode. The Testimonia increase as we approach the Middle Ages, but they are never so numerous, says Professor Smith, as the undoubted eminence of the author would appear to demand (211).

The fact is, however, that Ovid's commanding position in the literature of the world is largely due to

at least two aspects of his genius the influence of which is not revealed by such indicia. One of these is his command of metrical technique, the other, his ability to tell a story. The former is his greatest gift to Antiquity, the latter is the basis of his supreme importance in the aesthetic evolution of the Modern World. But in both cases what he really did pass into the communal fund of acquired ability, and the author of it became, as it were, 'depersonalized'. Hence the ancients forgot their debt to Ovid, just as we for the most part have finally forgotten ours. As a metrical artist, however, Ovid takes his place among the great poets of the world. In this respect he did for Roman poetry what Cicero had already done for Roman prose; he found it more or less local, and left it capable of universal use for an indefinite period. And when at the Renaissance we moderns at last outgrew the *Chanson de Gestes*, which babbled on like a brook through an entire pedigree, and the *Roman d'Aventures*, the incidents of which could be predicted in advance, and the *Fabliau* which, to say the least, was nothing new, we turned, with rare discrimination, to the greatest story-teller of the Roman world, we sat at the feet of the man who, as Mackail well says, 'fixed a certain ideal of civilized manners for the Latin Empire and for Modern Europe', and learned from him as best we could what it is that makes a story immortal and always young.

Professor Rand's review of Magnus's work took the form of an article, entitled *The New Critical Edition of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. He has praise for but one thing, apparently, in Magnus's edition—the extraordinary fulness of the apparatus criticus. He thinks, however, that the information in the apparatus criticus might have been presented more briefly, with much less ambiguity. He is not willing to follow Magnus in his classification of the MSS, nor does he follow Magnus's rejection of the theory of an archetype from which our present manuscripts are derived. Magnus believes that there were two ancient recensions, and a multiplicity of copies in the early Middle Ages. Professor Rand inclines (51-56) rather to the view that in the ninth century, perhaps in Ireland, there was a single manuscript (A) of Ovid, from which all our present manuscripts are descended. With the single manuscript, or with various copies of it, went a set of glosses of the kind abundantly familiar in the history of the early Middle Ages. Into all the descendants of A, glosses and emendations from the early medieval commentary have infiltrated in varying degrees. This early medieval commentary was written as early as the eleventh century. Professor Rand sums up thus (60):

So far, then, as these tests allow us to see, I believe that a great deal is yet to be done with the text of the *Metamorphoses*, in tracing its history in the Middle Ages, in distinguishing the classes of manuscripts, and in estimating the effect of mediaeval glossaries. . . of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, well called by

Traube the *Aetas Ovidiana*, when Ovid's intense popularity resulted in the elaborate glossing and collating and contaminating of his text. . . We need first a more thorough scouring of the *selva oscura* of glosses and classes. Then will be the time for some scholar with the genius and fine taste of Heinsius to make on the basis of ample and rationally sifted material a really critical edition of the Metamorphoses. For the present, the thesaurus of textual material which Magnus has accumulated after <25> years of patient toil will be an indispensable source of information for the critic and should stimulate research.

Professor Slater is even more severe than Professor Rand in his discussion of Magnus's work. He sums up as follows (60):

. . . I have used the book with increasing disappointment and distrust. A record—let alone an *editio critica*—should be faithful to the facts. Magnus has been overwhelmed by the mere mass of his material—'mole ruit sua'. . . . the book contains far too much slipshod and inaccurate work, together with a certain number of puerile errors. The unwieldy bulk of it and the outrageously large proportion of unimportant matter in the *app. crit.* are bound to tell heavily against it. . . . One cannot help wishing that Magnus had attempted less. With a narrower scope and greater vigilance he might have come much nearer than he does to that finality to which in the Praefatio he admits that he aspired.

Professor Slater thinks that the four volumes of Burmann's *Ovidii Opera Omnia* give better notes and after all a better apparatus criticus than we find in Magnus's edition.

C. K.

(To be concluded)

DOES LATIN 'FUNCTION'?

During the period, now happily drawing to a close, in which many were persuaded that the findings of experimental psychology supported the palpable fallacy 'We train <only> what we train', a great deal was written about 'dead-ends' in the High School course of study. Dr. Eliot, in particular, was fond of hurling this indictment against subjects such as algebra and Latin.

And, granting the premises, such indictment is logical enough. For, if the mind is made up of little water-tight compartments, and training in one compartment does not spread to another, then two years' training in algebra or Latin would have no value, except as they prepared the student for later use of algebra or Latin; and, inasmuch as most students cease to apply their algebraic knowledge, or to read much Latin, after completing the High School course, these subjects would become mere dead-ends, the time spent upon them being thrown away.

It is a pleasure to know that psychologists of note are now beginning to take sharp issue with those who publish such notions. As a matter of fact, the mind is not divided into small water-tight compartments; rather, its functions are inextricably bound together, thus providing for transfer of training at innumerable points. Hence a study may be so rich, through the

transferable training it gives, that its place in the curriculum is abundantly justified, even though the student, after graduation, may not pursue work directly along the same lines.

Thus, after the tumult caused by the 'Modern School and its fallacies, we come back again to the solid ground of common sense. Those who wish to know at first hand how the situation appears from the point of view of experimental psychology are referred to a brief and clearly written treatise by Professor G. M. Stratton, of the University of California¹.

Under these circumstances, it is painful and surprising to find a teacher of Latin so anxious to advance ideas of his own predilection that he attempts to use even this outworn dead-end argument to discredit present methods of teaching Latin. Listen to the following:

. . . But how long would the study of the piano, for example, retain its present enormous numbers of devotees, if it were known and understood that upon the termination of the last formal lesson the actual practice of the art would cease? But is not that precisely the incontrovertible fact regarding the students of Latin? Is it not true that even assuming that they gain an actual reading power over the language, the last assigned lesson in the last Latin course constitutes for the vast majority their last practice in the art? But continued use of an art is the only justification for its acquisition².

Presented without context, these words would not unnaturally be taken to be an excerpt from some old diatribe of Dr. Flexner or Dr. Eliot. The introduction of the comparison with music is palpably unfair. For, while many might be willing to admit that the study of music under the conditions here described would be a real dead-end, the case is far different with subjects like algebra and Latin, with their abundant and measurable transfer of training.

It should be added, further, that some courses of study or training yield additional results that are more elusive and hard to define and measure. The experience gained through them changes the mental outlook, and the people who have had the experience are not quite the same persons they would have been otherwise. Here are factors that thus far have been given too little attention. Indeed I am inclined to believe that Professor Stratton would not be ready to admit that training in music, even under the limitations above indicated, is necessarily a dead-end. At any rate he says³:

. . . Those especially should try to sing who have no promise of voice, those paint who never will be able to paint. Youthful attempts at the violin and sketching which come to nothing, I can testify, may make music and landscape constant sources of delight. Not, then, by their fruits visible to others are those childhood practices to be judged, but by what they leave behind concealed in the permanent springs of appreciation.

¹Developing Mental Power (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1922).

²The Classical Journal 17 (1921), 54.

³47-48. In this connection we may note, too, the rather clever retort of a lady to the dead-end argument, namely that, without question, she had received benefit from certain sermons the contents of which she could no longer recite (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15, 208).

The question, Does Latin Function?, is approached from another angle by the same Latin teacher⁴:

All this is on the assumption that the ability to read Latin is actually acquired. But that the great majority (probably 99 per cent) of the half million pupils now studying Latin in our secondary schools will never learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term is an obvious fact, too patent to require demonstration. . . .

Here is another shaft from the 'Modern School' armory, as is seen particularly in the liberal estimate "probably 99 per cent". One wonders, too, just what is meant by "learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term".

In the mouth of a professed educationalist, knowing little Latin and still less of the actual class-room problem, the phrase is apt to signify ability to handle at sight any stray bit of Latin selected without regard for the student's preparation, and unprovided with a context.

Such groundless assumption is doubtless fostered by the complacent impression that a year or two spent upon a Modern Language in the Public Schools will enable the fortunate student to hold his own in the country to which the language is indigenous. But there is strong reason for belief that there is nothing unique in the experience of the traveller who, on returning from abroad, said of his linguistic equipment that the only trouble was that the natives did not know French when they heard it!

From the point of view of one who knows anything about it, it is simply preposterous to expect children who have had two or three years of Latin to deal offhand with anything an 'investigator' cares to throw at their heads. Some years ago a selfappointed expert with more zeal than knowledge devised a test! He unearthed the aphorism, *Studium discendi voluntate quae cogi non potest constat*⁵. This he carried about in his vest-pocket, and, wherever he encountered anyone who had had at least one year of Latin at some time or other, he poked it at him. Finding that many were puzzled by the sentence, he raised the triumphant cry that he had proved "scientifically" that "Latin does not function"⁶.

The childish absurdity of this 'test' is so patent that there is no need to linger over it here, especially as its manifest unsuitability has been carefully analyzed elsewhere⁷. Really it is a wonder that a reputable journal will give space to such drivel as this 'test'.

Unless I am mistaken, teachers of the Classics themselves are somewhat at fault here. They have been subjected to such a fire of criticism and so menaced with the big stick of the (supposed) findings of psychology that many of them have grown very apologetic, and under the continuous hammering they are hypnotized into thinking that many of the charges may be true.

A case in point is that of the Latin teacher referred to above, who quotes so glibly, and even with a sort of relish, the dismal prognostication that, of all the pupils now studying Latin in the Schools, "probably 99 per cent . . . will never learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term . . .". I wish to enter a most emphatic protest against this weak and hurtful surrender to the enemy.

Let us look more closely into the question here at issue. Beyond a doubt, acquiring a complete mastery over Latin is no summer afternoon's picnic. Latin is a mine whose lowest depths have not yet been satisfactorily explored. After centuries of study, a multitude of passages remain, which, though apparently sound in text, are yet in meaning a bone of contention among scholars.

To come a little nearer home, I ask the following question: How many teachers, yes, good teachers of High School Latin, who have spent five years or more in that work, would undertake without special preparation to translate at sight any isolated random short passage from the complete works of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, and Ovid? In response to such a call, I do not think that many volunteers would present themselves. But would that mean that Latin does not function? Of course not; it means that, in the matter of translation, Latin does not function *that far*.

Well, then, let us be reasonable in what we expect of children in the Schools. After two or three years of Latin, a boy will not be in a position to pick up Lucretius for light reading after School hours. But our educational friends (who know nothing about the matter) are ready to write down High School Latin a failure, unless it accomplishes some such miracle.

Witness the individual referred to above, who presented to people with as little as one year of instruction in Latin a bit of crabbed modern Latin, abstract in thought, without context, and (to a High School student) strange in structure and diction. Finding them puzzled by the sentence, he raises the joyous paean, "Latin doesn't function, Latin doesn't function"! You might about as well say the same of mathematics, on the ground that a boy who has just completed plane geometry falls down on a problem involving calculus.

In point of translation, Latin 'functions' for the Second Year student, if he can handle at sight simple, clear sentences made up of materials with which he has had a chance to become reasonably familiar; e. g. *Erat una navis Rhodis in dextro cornu Caesaris longe ab reliquis collocata; Cui coactus est Caesar ferre subsidium, ne turpem in conspectu hostium contumeliam acciperet; Quod nisi nox proelium diremisset, tota classe hostium Caesar potitus esset.* These sentences are picked up, as the book opens, at random from the *Bellum Alexandrinum* II. Possibly *turpem . . . contumeliam* and *diremisset* should not be used in a Second Year test; for, as a matter of information, I may state that a student does not *always* remember a thing he has seen but once or twice. But, in a general way, these examples will serve to show what

⁴The Classical Journal 17.54.

⁵A bit of modern Latin written by Arnauld.

⁶Theory and Verification, by Joseph Kennedy, School and Society 4.279 ff. (August 19, 1916).

⁷Education 38.460 ff. (February, 1918).

grade of attainment in reading might reasonably be expected of students after two years of good teaching.

To sum up, then, the benefits of a High School course in Latin might be outlined as follows:

(1) Transfer of general training in the matter of habits of perseverance, close observation, power of discrimination, etc.

(2) Enlargement of the mental outlook through the venture into this new field of thought and feeling.

(3) A closer touch with men and things of old; and an entrance (even though slight) into the fellowship of world scholarship.

(4) More or less consciously cultivated by-products, such as insight into the English language, foundation for study of the Romance languages, etc.

(5) A power to read the Latin language commensurate with the time spent in the study.

This is the program where Latin is taught 'as an end in itself', as is the case now almost everywhere. The ideal, of course, is not attained in all Schools, nor with all pupils (but we may note, in passing, that the same thing could be said of all other High School subjects). But it is an ideal well worth working toward; and with certain minor improvements in method we may approximate it more nearly.

Those who believe in maintaining this ideal will do well to watch closely the progress of the Latin Investigation undertaken by the American Classical League. For the bitter attack upon present methods and aims in Latin teaching referred to above is launched with the definite purpose of clearing the way for a very different program, according to which all effort would be discontinued to bring the rank and file of students to a reading power in the language, and the time would be devoted more particularly to the by-products included under number 4 above⁸.

Aside from all other considerations, I venture to call attention here to the fact that it would be extremely poor strategy to greet groups of prospective beginners in Latin with the announcement that they cannot hope to acquire any sort of reading knowledge of the language, even after three or four years of study. For it is entirely natural that children should expect to learn to read Latin, and that they should gauge the success of their efforts very largely by the progress made in that direction.

Decision to hold to the program of studying Latin for the sake of Latin (rather than for the sake of its by-products) does not mean, of course, that some readjustment should not be made (especially under number 4) to make it certain that even the students who enjoy but a brief course shall carry away with them certain tangible benefits.

On the other hand, readjustment of a different kind may be desirable under number 5. At any rate it seems clear that, in the past, the failure of multitudes of students to get upon their feet in the matter of translation was due to the haste with which they were plunged into their first author. With different

treatment at this point, many who now fail might be brought on safely to real reading power.

A hopeful sign of the times is to be seen in the growing favor with which many are regarding the proposal to lengthen the period devoted to 'beginning Latin', thus making it possible to preface Caesar with a considerable amount of easier reading.

It is unfortunate that no Roman author of the classical period has bequeathed to us just the sort of material best suited to this purpose. But, on the other hand, the prejudice against adapted and made Latin has in great measure abated; and, with controlled vocabulary and syntax, it is no impossible task to construct a ladder along which the student may proceed with confidence and a feeling of success to the more difficult reading to be found in his first author.

In any case, we are likely soon to be confronted with a sharp issue. Shall we continue to teach Latin for the sake of Latin, making special provision for those who do not carry the subject far, and, in addition, perfecting the means of developing reading power? Or, for the rank and file of students, shall we frankly give up any attempt to teach them to read the language, making of the Latin course a 'Modern School' factory for intensive production along the lines indicated under number 4?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

REVIEW

The Laws of Plato. The Text, Edited with Introduction, Notes, Etc. Two Volumes. By E. B. England. Manchester: At the University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. (1921). Pp. 641, 669.

To edit the *Laws of Plato* as Mr. England has done is a task worth while, and his work deserves a welcome. It is, he reminds us, the only complete edition of this dialogue with an English commentary. Editions of separate books are rare. Seventy-five years ago, an American scholar, Tayler Lewis, under the title *Plato Against the Atheists*, published as a College text-book an edition of Book 10. He chose this book because it seemed to him to be "the best central position from whence to make excursions over a large part of the Platonic philosophy". Certain famous passages from the *Laws* occur in our text editions of selections from Plato; but in general it is true that one who would read the *Laws* reads the plain text or Jowett. The publication of this edition constitutes an invitation to read, in the original, this much neglected work.

Mr. England has done for the *Laws* what James Adam did for the *Republic*, in that he has furnished an edition of the dialogue entire, in moderate compass and with a scholarly commentary. One could wish that he had followed the current practice of putting text and notes on the same page. Even the textual notes are not given under the text. Practical considerations may have been decisive here, for Mr.

⁸The Classical Journal 17.52 ff.

England does not limit himself to the ordinary critical annotation, with a mere registry of apparatus, but discusses, often quite fully, the processes of textual corruption and restoration. The text is, fundamentally, that of the Oxford edition, but Mr. England has proceeded with independence, adopting frequently readings proposed as emendations. In the whole body of the notes, which in the two volumes together comprise over 800 pages, a due proportion is kept between textual and other matters. Grammatical usage receives attention. For example, the tendency, more marked in the Laws than in the earlier works, to extend the use of periphrastic forms, such as *εστι* or *γίγνεται* with a participle, is noticed and the material is indexed. The wide range of the discussion in the Laws calls for comment upon the most diverse themes. The Notes make abundant use of the literature of Platonic interpretation, and display good critical judgment. There is fulness, perhaps a colloquial fulness, that reveals processes as well as results. But not many find the Laws easy reading, and most of us may get instruction from these glimpses into the editor's workshop.

Mr. England makes special acknowledgment of the works of Constantin Ritter, *Darstellung des Inhalts, und Kommentar zum Griechischen Texte*. One may conjecture that Ritter's *Darstellung* inspired Mr. England to the preparation of one of the most valuable parts of his edition, the Analyses. At the beginning of each volume an analysis of the contents, book by book, precedes the text. In addition to these analyses, covering some seventy pages, there is prefixed to each book a "short analysis" of a dozen lines.

In the history of European political theory a position of honor has always been accorded to Plato, and to the Laws. One misses in this latest dialogue the stylistic excellencies that belong to the earlier works, vivacity, concreteness of expression, dramatic power. It is the aged Plato, but still Plato. The Doctrine of the Soul is still supreme, and the problem of Man in Society presses for solution. There is, then, a field for this edition of the Laws, which renders more accessible an important part of Plato's thinking. And Plato's thinking, whether this part of it or any other, has for the generous mind of youth to-day the same informing and revealing quality which Tayler Lewis recognized when he penned these words for his College textbook: "The young man who is an enthusiastic student of Plato can never be a sciolist in regard to education, a quack in literature, a demagogue in politics or an infidel in religion".

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

The Mythology of Vergil's Aeneid According to Servius. By John Prentice Taylor. A New York University Dissertation (1917). Privately Printed. Pp. 62.

A proper appreciation of Vergil's work is impossible without some consideration of the exhaustive commentary of the Roman grammarian Servius, of the

fourth century. Much of the medieval tradition of Vergil was derived, albeit indirectly, from Servius; and modern commentators have not failed to express their admiration and respect for this, the first great interpreter of Rome's national poet. Because of the tendency of modern scholars to consider the authors themselves rather than what early commentators have said about them, the sum of scholarly production on Servius is not large; hence any new addition to the bibliography must be eagerly welcomed. Again, the task of making a comprehensive study of Servius has been rendered especially onerous because Thilo's great edition of Servius has never been supplied with an index.

The present dissertation is an elaborate study of Servius's expositions of Vergil's mythology. No attempt is made to give an exhaustive treatment of all Roman mythology; the author declares in his Introduction that he has confined himself

to those personages, whether gods or heroes, who became actual objects of worship at some time or other. Hence some of the hero-tales to which Servius refers will not be found here, since many of the heroes remain of purely human interest in their deeds and relationships.

This delimitation at once removes from the discussion many of the myths to which Vergil devoted most time.

The dissertation begins with a short discussion of Servius and his work (Chapter I, 1-3). Then follows a chapter (4-5) on the method of Servius, in which something is said of his sources and of his use of authorities. Then comes (6-7) a short discussion of Roman mythology, in which distinction is made between the native Italic *numina* and the gaudy characters of the imported Hellenic mythology. This is followed by an elaborate catalogue of the gods and goddesses in their degree, with observations on their cultus, and quotations from Servius (Chapters IV-VI, 8-31, 32-48, 49-56). At the head of this mythological Who's Who stand the twelve Olympians; then follow in order Saturnus, Faunus, Bacchus, Amor, Ianus, Atlas, the Furies, Cybele, Iris, Penates, Lares, the Lower World, Hercules, Aesculapius, Romulus et Remus. Everything that Servius says about these ancient worthies has painstakingly been extracted and presented in concise form, together with explanatory observations on the general significance of the character considered.

This constitutes the bulk of the dissertation. There is another short chapter (VII, 57-60) which treats of the Cumæan Sibyl and of the Fates; these personages, though they were not objects of direct veneration, are nevertheless of great importance in the history of Roman religion and mythology. In this chapter are given, also, references to some of the most important non-religious myths, such as those of Orpheus, Theseus, etc.

Dr. Taylor has, in the main, acquitted himself creditably of his task. His monograph shows evidences of care and devotion; it will serve as a convenient compendium of Servius's mythological promenades. Some of Dr. Taylor's statements require,

however, some slight modification. So, for example, he says (1):

Vergil's interest was doubtless, in a large degree, apologetic. He sought to win over to the cause of Augustus any of the old republican spirits, who might be grieving at the passing of the elder time of political liberty.

This statement gives the impression that Vergil was indulging in antirepublican propaganda. As a matter of fact, Vergil seems consciously to avoid the monarchical note in the Aeneid, although he does devote much laudation to the Julian Line. This is the more striking because Vergil was the first of Roman writers to glorify the young Octavian with divine attributes¹.

Again, in his commentary, Servius followed the tendency of the period in laying great stress on etymology. Dr. Taylor would have done well to point out that many of these etymologies are not to be relied on. The scholars of the fourth century are inordinately fond of etymologizing, but their zeal often betrays them, and Servius was no exception to this rule². Many of the etymologies in the Servian commentary which can confidently be rejected have none the less done much to give a false impression of the history of a nation's religious belief. As Sayce says, "False etymologies are of themselves the fruitful causes of myths".

More care in printing, and the avoidance of certain ineptitudes of style would have done much to improve what is intrinsically a rather scholarly piece of work.

UNION COLLEGE

HARRISON CADWALLADER COFFIN

NOTES ON ELEUSIS

Under the expert and generous guidance of Dr. Orlando, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens had the opportunity in April of studying recent developments at Eleusis. Dr. Orlando paid special attention to his restoration of the triumphal arches at the sides of the Great Propylaea, which are close copies of the Arch of Hadrian at Athens; to the construction of the portico of the Telesterion, which apparently had a gable; and to the tympanum of the Great Propylaea, of which the central block is tongued into the side blocks as in the Propylaea on the Acropolis (see W. B. Dinsmoor, American Journal of Archaeology, 14 [1910], 149). With regard to the Temple of Artemis the corrections Dr. Orlando makes in the drawings by Gandy (Antiquities of Attica, Chapter V. Plates 1-8) are considerable. In consequence, Figure 352, on page 309, of Marquand, Greek Architecture, and the statement directly below it must be described as incorrect.

It is established beyond doubt that the temple was not a double temple *in antis*, a type of which we have no examples and which probably never existed. The evidence for this is an epistyle block, which on account of the oblique cuttings of its inner corners, the an-

¹Compare Tenney Frank, Vergil, A Biography, 174 ff.

²Compare W. P. Mustard, The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil (Johns Hopkins University Dissertation, 1892).

tithema of the inner surface, and the planed under surface with abacus marking, could only have served in the south side of the rear porch of a prostyle building.

Among other corrections of note are the following: (1) The walls are not of uniform thickness at top and bottom, but have a slight diminution (.58 cm. at top instead of .60 cm.). The epistyle block (.78 cm.) consequently projects widely (Gandy's epistyle block does not belong in this building). The rather awkward effect is relieved by Lesbian leaf and dart mouldings on both outer and inner surfaces; (2) The front porch is not of the same depth as the rear, but is approximately twice as deep; (3) the inclination of the tympanum is 1:3.28, more pronounced than that given by Gandy (1:3.67).

Regarding the date, Dr. Orlando, from the type of foundation, the number of steps (five), the size of the front porch, and the slope of the tympanum, argues that the work is undoubtedly Roman. It appears likely, however, that it slightly antedates the Great Propylaea, which is of the Antonine period; not only is the technique of the stone-working earlier, but also the lack of orientation with reference to the Propylaea and the fact that Pausanias mentions the temple (1.38.6) confirm the earlier date.

AMERICAN SCHOOL, ATHENS, GREECE

W. R. AGARD

MARTIAL AND MORLEY ON SMELLS

In Christopher Morley's Chimneysmoke, a delightful book of his collected verse, there is a short lyric entitled "Smells", in which the author asks:

Why is it that the poets tell
So little of the sense of smell?

One might do worse than refer Mr. Morley to the poet Martial, not so much to answer his query as to present to him an exception to the implication contained therein. For it would appear from his own words that the great Roman epigrammatist had an extremely sensitive nose, in spite of existing sanitary conditions that must have demanded a certain deadening of the olfactory sense to insure peace of mind. He makes mention, complainingly, several times of the unwelcome odor of purple-dyed garments—*olidae vestes murice* (e. g. 1.49.32; 4.4.6.; 9.62). On the other hand, of the heavy scent of Roman perfumes he was continually aware, as he testifies frequently in verse (e. g. 3.55; 6.55.3; 7.41; 9.26.2; 10.38.8; 11.8.9; 12.55.7; 14.59.2; etc.) that must have served the perfumery firms of Cosmus and Niceros with abundant advertising copy. (In Morley's "Smells (Junior)", Mother is redolent "of lavender and listerine"; in Martial 3.55 Gellia smells pungently of Cosmus's wares).

For Martial, odors fall into two categories: unpleasant and pleasant. He has catalogued both kinds for us in three particular poems. In 4.4 he describes with no mincing words why the company of Bassa was distinctly distasteful to his aesthetic sense on its olfactory side; and he is just as frank with

Thais in 6.93. On the other hand, he has listed in 11. 8.1-12 the pleasant scents that command to him his slave boy (I give the translation of Mr. W. A. C. Ker):

Breath of balm shed from foreign trees, of the last effluence that falls from a curving jet of saffron; perfume of apples ripening in their winter chest, of the field lavish with the leafage of spring; of Augusta's silken robes from Palatine presses, of amber warmed by a maiden's hand; of a jar of dark Falernian shattered, but far off, of a garden that stays therein Sicilian bees; the scent of Cosmus' alabaster boxes, and of the altars of the gods; of a chaplet fallen but now from a rich man's locks—why should I speak of each? Not enough are they: mix them all; such is the fragrance of my boy's kisses at morn.

Surely Martial should satisfy Mr. Morley.

It is interesting to note in this connection that Edmund Burke, in his Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful (Part II, Section 21), observes that

Smells and Tastes have some share too in ideas of greatness; but it is a small one, weak in its nature, and confined in its operations. . . . when they are moderated, as in a description or narrative, they become sources of the sublime, as genuine as any other, and upon the very same principle of a moderated pain.

He quotes *Aeneid* 7.81-84 and 6.237-241 as passages in which mention of odors in no way detracts from the sublimity of the picture as otherwise delineated.

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL. JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.
PHILADELPHIA

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

I

Annalen der Philosophie—1921, Die Philosophie des Altertums, Richard Hönigswald, favorably reviewed by Friedrich Bülow.

Archiv für Anthropologie—1921, Raetia und Vindelicia bei Claudius Ptolemäus, C. Mehlis.

Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen—Sept., 1921, Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer, S. Eitrem, favorably reviewed by Otto Weinreich; *Lucrèce, De la Nature*, edited and translated by A. Ernout, reviewed by H. Diels [both text and translation of this volume of the New French Series of Classical Texts, mentioned in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15. 136, are severely condemned. Diels's review is largely a defence of Lachmann against Ernout. He does not mention Munro or Bailey; of English-speaking scholars he names only Wakefield and Merrill, on whose 'convenient thesaurus' M. Ernout was, he hints, unduly dependent. Diels's eagerness to make a point is seen, for example, in his condemnation of M. Ernout for failing to understand that in 2.18 *mente* is a nominative form. But is it certain that it is a nominative, or even that it is the right reading? Lachmann read *menti*].

Hibbert Journal—Jan., The Value of Plato's Laws To-day, Mrs. A. M. Adam; A Critical History of Greek Philosophy, W. T. Stace, reviewed by Dorothy Tarrant [the book is said to be clear, readable,

bracing, but incomplete, since religion, psychology, and ethics are not included, and the post-Aristotelian systems are treated too briefly].

International Journal of Ethics—Jan., Plato and the Moral Standard, II, R. C. Lodge ["The final standard of value, in every case, has turned out to be objectivity, or the degree to which a proposed course of action, or a character under investigation, is patterned upon the ideal principles which, for Plato, constitute reality". For the first instalment of this paper see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.112]; The Message of Plato: A Reinterpretation of the Republic, Edward J. Urwick, reviewed, favorably, by J. S. Mackenzie.

Isis—May, 1921, *Lucrèce, De la Nature*, edited and translated by A. Ernout, reviewed, favorably, by George Sarton [M. Sarton declares that the volumes in the New French Series of Classical Texts are in no way inferior to those in the Loeb Classical Library, and cost less than half as much]; *Les Civilisations Préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Egée*, René Dussaud, reviewed by George Sarton [the book is declared to be of lasting value, if only the author will take the trouble to bring it up to date]; Discovery in Greek Lands, F. H. Marshall, reviewed by George Sarton [see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14. 166-167]; *Kunstgewerbliche Altertümer und Kuriösitäten*, J. G. Th. Graesse, reviewed by G. S.

Man—Feb., Horned Deities, Harold Peake [deals with the Gallic god Cernunnos; this god Sir John Rhys identifies with the *Dis pater* from whom, according to Caesar, the Gauls claimed descent].

Nature—Feb. 9, The Legacy of Greece, edited by R. W. Livingstone, reviewed by F. S. Marvin.

New York Times Book Review and Magazine—Feb. 26, A Humanist in the Desert of Materialism, Richard Le Gallienne [a most sympathetic review of Tradition and Progress, Gilbert Murray].

Organization Republican—Jan. 7, The Problem of Housing in Rome, D. Havelock Fisher.

Philosophical Review—Jan., Sextus Empiricus and the Modern Theory of Knowledge, James Lindsay [the author declares that Sextus anticipates modern thinkers, such as Kant]; Conflicting Interpretations of Heracleitus, Daniel S. Robinson [the interpretations are those of Theodore De Laguna, The Importance of Heracleitus, Philosophical Review, May, 1921; and Hermann Diels, in the article on Heracleitus, in Hastings's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics 6].

Revue Universitaire—March, Une Histoire de l'Enseignement Secondaire Français, Gaston Cayran [a review of G. Weill, *Histoire de l'Enseignement Secondaire en France, 1802-1920*, favorable, except that the writer takes issue with M. Weill's evident hostility to the Classics]; Chronique du Mois, André Balz [includes a brief discussion of the present dispute in France between the 'ancients' and the 'moderns', a dispute in which the writer sees nothing new; he approves the recommendation of the Con-

fédération des Travailleurs Intellectuels, that two absolutely equivalent degrees be conferred, one for classical, the other for modern, studies; and holds that "la suppression des humanités modernes" would increase the number of undesirable, because mediocre, students in the Latin classes]; Bulletin de l'Enseignement Secondaire des Jeunes Filles, Jeanne P. Crouzet-Ben-Aben [apparently a special phase of the French dispute in regard to Latin involves the place of the humanities in girls' Schools; the writer cites with approval M. J. Gervais, who in the Bulletin de l'Université et de l'Académie de Toulouse, pleads that in the girls' Lycées an important place be given to Latin, closely combined with French]; La Culture Latine et l'Esprit Scientifique [recounts an experiment of M. H. Dupret, of the Collège d'Arras. Students of the Troisième Classique and the Quatrième Moderne studied mathematics together; in the beginning the 'Fourth-class Modern' students did better, because of their more advanced state; but, as early as February or March, the 'Third-class Classical' students gained first place, and held it the rest of the year]; unsigned review of Manuel de Phonétique Latine, A. C. Juret [a "bel effort scientifique"].

Scientia—Jan. and Feb., Le Sciences Grecques et leur Transmission, J. L. Heiberg [Part I. Splendeur et Décadence de la Science Grecque; Part II. L'Oeuvre de Conservation et de Transmission des Byzantins et des Arabes. The author concludes with the statement that modern science will not have discharged its great debt to its Greek predecessor until there shall have been issued critical editions of all the texts handed down to us]; *L'Unité Romane*, A. Meillet [the author holds that the Romance languages furnish an excellent proof of the fact that all linguistic unity is based on unity of civilization either present or past].

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

II

America—April 8, How Many Homers Were There?, Francis P. Donnelly, S. J. [a brief notice of The Unity of Homer, John A. Scott].

American Historical Review—Jan., Ettore Pais, *Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani*, reviewed, favorably, by R. V. D. Magoffin.—April, Tylissos à l'Époque Minoenne: Étude de Préhistoire Crète, Joseph Hazzidakis, reviewed by W. S. Ferguson; Les Indo-Européens: Préhistoire des Langues, des Moeurs, et des Croyances de l'Europe, Albert Carnoy, reviewed by Franklin Edgerton.—July, Korakou: A Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth, Carl W. Blegen, reviewed by David M. Robinson.

American Philosophical Society, Proceedings, LXI, 1—The Use of Devices for Indicating Vowel Length in Latin, John C. Rolfe.

Archiv für Anthropologie, XVIII—Primitives Geld, G. Thilenius.

Army Quarterly—July, Marius and the Germanic Invasion of 105 B. C. [the author is not named].

Art and Archaeology—Jan., Travel Among the Ancient Romans, William West Mooney, reviewed by David M. Robinson; Andivius Hedulio: Adventures of a Roman Nobleman in the Days of the Empire, Edward Lucas White, reviewed by Mitchell Carroll. Feb., Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art, W. W. Hyde, reviewed by Alfred Emerson; A History of European and American Sculpture from the Early Christian Period to the Present Day, 2 volumes, Chandler R. Post, reviewed by Mitchell Carroll.—April, Greek Vase-Painting, Ernst Buschor, translated by G. C. Richards, reviewed by David M. Robinson.—May, Excavations in Greece in 1921, C. W. Blegen [illustrated]; Art and Archaeology in Italy in 1921, Guido Calza.—June, Korakou, A Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth, Carl W. Blegen, reviewed, favorably, by David M. Robinson; The Home of the Indo-Europeans, Harold H. Bender, reviewed by Mitchell Carroll.—August, The Art and Archaeology of the Dalmatian Coast, H. R. Fairclough; A Roman Colony in the Alps, E. D. Pierce; A Swiss Mystery, Ethel Hugli Camp; The Etruscan Tomb of the Volumni near Perugia, Ada M. Trotter; A Text-Book of European Archaeology, R. A. S. Macalister, re-reviewed by Charles Peabody; Figurative Terra-Cotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium in the VI and V Centuries B. C., E. Douglas Van Buren, reviewed by David M. Robinson; An Introduction to the Study of Terra Sigillata Treated from a Chronological Standpoint, Felix Oswald and T. Davies Price, reviewed by David M. Robinson.

Art Bulletin—Sept., 1921, The Age of the Extant Columns of the Olympieum at Athens, A. D. Fraser.

Biblical Review—April, July, Disintegration of the Roman Empire and Augustine's City of God, E. G. Sihler.

Bibliotheca Sacra—April, Paul's Roman Citizenship as Reflected in his Missionary Experiences and his Letters, James L. Kelso.

Boston Evening Transcript—June 27, Faneuil Hall and the Parthenon [editorial on the coming Third Annual Meeting of the American Classical League].

—July 3, Classics' Hour at Hand [an account of the papers at the Third Annual Meeting of the American Classical League].

Campion—Feb., Bryant's "Antiquity of Freedom", A. F. Geyser, S. J. [a translation into Latin hexameters].

Canisius Monthly—Jan., Sancta Maria, by Ladislaus Kreciszewski [a Latin poem, consisting of 11 Sapphic and Adonic stanzas].

Colonnade—XIV, 1919-1922, The Twelfth Oratio of Dio of Prusa: A Translation, William E. Waters [pages 183-201].

C. K.